

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 5, and 7 to 9 have been amended based on the original description so as to clarify the present invention.

New claims 10-13 have been added.

No new matter is added.

II. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner has suggested Claims 7-9 be changed from "wherein" to "further comprising" as applied to Claim 5 in the previous Office Action. Applicant respectively submits that the suggested amendment of Claim 5 appears to be different from the intention of the present invention. However, Claims 5 and 7-9 have been amended so as to correct the informalities and clarify the present invention.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 have been rejected as being anticipated by Chinese Patent CN 1285249A to Shusen et al. ("Shusen"). Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 of the present invention is not anticipated by Shusen.

Regarding amended Claim 1, Shusen does not disclose or suggest that the rectangular member is die-forged into a rectangular shape. In Shusen, a ring-shaped plate is formed by punching the center of a disc (shown in FIGS. 3 and 4). Then, corners are formed by expanding the

ring-shaped plate (shown in FIG. 5), and the rectangular frame body is formed by die forging (shown in FIG. 1). Namely, the frame of Shusen is formed from a ring-shape into a rectangular-shape via a ring-shape.

On the other hand, in the present invention, as defined in amended Claim 1, the frame body is formed by die forging after forming the rectangular member from the ring-shaped member. Namely, the frame body according to amended Claim 1 is formed from a ring-shape into a rectangular-shape via an intermediate rectangular-shape.

According to the manufacturing method of amended Claim 1, since a rectangular member is die-forged from a rectangular member, the corners of the die can be prevented from biting the corners of the rectangular member and burrs of the frame body can be prevented. If the ring-shaped member is die-forged as in Shusen, the biting of corners would easily occur and burrs would also easily occur due to the die.

Therefore, the present invention can greatly improve the material yield compared with the conventional method. Accordingly, Shusen does not disclose each and every element of independent claim 1 as amended and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 2, Shusen does not disclose or suggest that the angle of the corner of the rectangular member is formed smaller than the angle of the corner of the frame body.

FIG. 6 of Shusen, which was pointed out by the Examiner, shows a shape of a die for forming the corner, but it does not show a shape or angle of the rectangular member. The corner of the member after the process of FIG. 6 would become larger than the corner of the die because of a spring back or the like. Even if the corner of the die and the member while clipped in the die are smaller than the corner of the frame body, it does not mean that the corner of the rectangular member which is removed from the die is made smaller than that of the frame body.

In particular, Shusen does not disclose or suggest forming an intermediate member into a rectangular-shape having corners. That is to say, the corner of the rectangular member cannot be formed previous to forming the frame body by Shusen.

According to the manufacturing method of Claim 2, the advantageous effects can be obtained such as mentioned in the specification, page 10, line 10 to page 11, line. Accordingly, Shusen does not disclose each and every element of Claim 2 as amended and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

As has been explained in the above, currently amended Claim 1 of the present invention includes the above-mentioned features, which are not disclosed or suggested in Shusen, and results in the above-mentioned technical advantages; therefore, the Applicants believe that currently amended Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Further, Applicant respectfully states that claims 2-5 and 7-11 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Each and every point raised in the Office Action dated August 8, 2006 has been addressed on the basis of the above amendments and remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-5 and 7-11 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: December 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Raffaele A. DeMarco

Registration No.: 54,061

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant